R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 024 UD 002 470

BASIC SPEECH IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS--REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS.

BY- CARTON, AARON S.
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.96 49P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *SPEECH IMPROVEMENT, PRIVATE SCHOOLS, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, OBJECTIVES, *EVALUATION, EVALUATION METHODS, PERSONNEL, QUESTIONNAIRES, SCHOOL ATTITUDES, TEACHING METHODS, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I PROJECT

THE QUALITY, FEASIBILITY, AND APPROPRIATENESS OF A NONPUBLIC DAY SCHOOL SPEECH IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM WERE ASSESSED. EVALUATIONS OF THE RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM WERE BASED ON PUPIL PROGRESS REPORTS, OBSERVED SPEECH IMPROVEMENT, AND RESPONSES TO STAFF QUESTIONNAIRES. SOME DIFFICULTY WAS ENCOUNTERED IN MEASURING THE IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM ON PUPIL SPEECH IMPROVEMENT BECAUSE OF THE INADEQUATE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM AND ITS SHORT DURATION. IT WAS FOUND THAT THE PROGRAM SUFFERED FROM PROBLEMS IN PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT, DIFFERING INTERPRETATIONS OF OBJECTIVES, LARGE CLASSES, AND A LACK OF INTEGRATION INTO THE REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM. (NC)

ED011024

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

BASIC SPEECH IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR DISADVANTAGED PUPILS IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS -- REGULAR DAY SCHOOLS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Dr. Aaron S. Carton, Research Director
Assistant Professor of Education
Division of Teacher Education
The City University of New York

August 31, 1966

VO 002 470

27p.

1. SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal for the project, Basic Speech Improvement Program for Disadvantaged Pupils in Non-Public Schools - Regular Day Schools, described two phases:

a) A preliminary, or interim program running from April 14, 1966 to June 30, 1966, to be conducted in ten schools for approximately 7,000 children; and

b) A more complete program projected for the 1966-1967 academic year to be conducted in 53 schools for approximately 60,000 children.

This report is concerned with the preliminary, interim program. It was hoped that the evaluation would reveal and analyze whatever unanticipated problems and difficulties occurred in the execution of the preliminary program so that the larger program, scheduled for the 1966-1967 academic year, could be more effectively conducted. Recommendations at the conclusion of this report are based on the findings of the evaluation.

Objectives of a Basic Speech Improvement Program

According to the proposal, the Program was formulated to rectify the inadequacy of the present approach to basic speech education. It was argued that the poor, fragmented and inarticulate speech patterns of pupils coming from economically disadvantaged areas requires for its improvement a program in which teachers who are specialists in speech education work in cooperation with classroom teachers. While classroom teachers are considered to be insufficiently prepared to carry out a speech program, they are felt to be best equipped for relating speech activities to all areas of instruction.

"Procedural objectives" of the Program (that is to say those characteristics of the Program described as objectives in the proposal) consisted of:

a) The provision of "an organized, sequential program of direct instruction in the skills of speaking and listening for all pupils in the selected schools;" and

b) The provision of opportunities "for self-expression and cultural enrichment through experiences in the speech arts and applied forms of speech (group discussions, oral reporting, etc.)."

The educational objective of the Program (that is, the learning envisaged for pupils) was the development of "the ability to use speech skills effectively in practical speaking situations."

Ultimately, the project was expected to contribute substantially to social mobility of disadvantaged children by developing in them communication skills that would enhance their social effectiveness. Implicit in this social aim of the project was the furthering of racial integration.

Projected Procedures of the Program

A team of two teachers of speech improvement, working in cooperation with classroom teachers, was to provide each school in the Program with the equivalent of five days of teaching time per week. In order to conduct an organized sequential program of instruction in the skills of listening and speaking the following activities were envisaged:

a) Teacher conferences for in-service training and cooperative planning;

b) A series of demonstration lessons by speech improvement teachers in each classroom;

c) Additional speech lessons by classroom teachers for integrating speaking and listening skills with other areas of instruction;

d) Consultation and the provision of resource material by speech improvement teachers to classroom teachers; and

e) A three-day orientation program for speech improvement teachers.

Recordings and tests of pupils' speech, as well as interim and final reports on various areas of the project, are listed in the proposal with no specification as to when, where, how, and by whom these were to be obtained.

Provisions for Evaluation

The proposal provided for evaluation of the entire Program by the Center for Urban Education. The approaches to the evaluation of the entire Program listed in the proposal were:

a) Measurement of pupils' progress:

b) Observational assessments of pupils' progress by speech improvement teachers and classroom teachers; and

c) Questionnaires to classroom teachers, speech improvement teachers, and school supervisors.

For the preliminary Program an interim evaluation "utilizing standardized test results and special and regular school records and data" is mentioned in one paragraph (page 4 of the Proposal). Elsewhere in the Proposal (page 5) the interim evaluation is described as consisting only of "assessments through observations of pupils' progress...by classroom teachers and special speech teachers." This inconsistency is, no doubt, to be attributed to an editorial oversight. As no objective test data were available, the present evaluation is based essentially on observations and interviews.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The organization and planning of the evaluation of the preliminary Program occurred on very short notice, after the Program was already initiated and only weeks before the Program was scheduled to terminate. It was impossible, therefore,

to plan an elaborate evaluation that would focus on the essential object of the project--the amount and kind of changes in speech skills the pupils' exhibited. It was deemed proper, instead, to conduct an evaluation that would seek to achieve the objectives listed below.

a) An assessment of the degree to which the program described in the proposal was in fact implemented and some indications of the quality, or the appropriateness to objectives, of the implementation.

b) An analysis of the logic and feasibility of the educational objectives of the Program and a rough assessment of the degree to which the conduct of the Program was appropriate to its objectives.

c) A specification of the problems encountered in the execution of the preliminary Program that might suggest revisions and improvements in the plan of operation for the more complete Program projected for 1966-1967.

No attempt was made to measure what learning had occurred. No test data of any kind were available,nor was it deemed feasible to collect such data during the evaluation of the preliminary Program. Data of this nature could not be compared with measures made on participating pupils prior to the Program or with measurements on appropriate control groups and would, therefore, be meaningless. Further, speech programs of the kind described in the proposal are rather novel in American schools and few, if any, adequate and appropriate tests or measures are available. Indeed it was felt that the analysis of educational objectives of the Basic Speech Improvement Program might contribute to the development of such measures.

3. METHODOLOGY

The scope of the preliminary Program was small. The objectives of the evaluation were proportionately limited. The evaluation proceeded only by means of:

a) Examining available appropriate documents relating to the Program;

b) Visits to the schools in which the Program was conducted and observations of classroom instructions; and

c) Interviews and discussions with personnel connected with the Program.

Three schools were visited for what amounted to the major part of the school day. Preliminary contact was established in a fourth school. Visits involved observations, formal interviews, and some informal interaction with administrators and teachers in an attempt to discover "what was really going on."

4. FINDINGS

Degree of Implementation of Projected Procedures

Personnel. A table supplied by the Board of Education of the City of New York, Bureau for Speech Improvement showing the "Location of Non-Public Schools by Attendance Areas..." revealed that in the preliminary Basic Speech Improvement Program seven teachers of speech improvement were involved in eight schools. All of these teachers served on a part-time basis and a count of the number of working days (in which notations such as "P.M."and "3 hours" were considered half-days) revealed that at the time the table was prepared the non-public schools were supplied with a total of 12 days of speech-improvement teaching time per week. Discussions with the Program Coordinator revealed, however, that teaching personnel for the Program were not all available on the scheduled first day of operation and that some teachers began serving as much as two or three weeks later. Even if the last noted fact is discounted, 13 teaching days per week is merely outlined in the proposal (i.e. teams of two teachers each providing 10 schools with a total of five teaching days per week).

Obviously the recruitment of qualified personnel proved to be a major problem in implementing the Basic Speech Improvement Program. The most lavish allocations of funds for projects cannot assure adequate implementation unless the appropriate personnel can be assigned. Speech improvement programs are still rather limited for the New York Public Schools and the numbers of teachers specifically trained for such programs seems in general to be considerably smaller than the demand. Further, the pitfalls of attempting to initiate the Program in April, upon very short notice, when most qualified teachers are not available on the teachers' labor market are obvious. It may be pointed out, furthermore, that if there are no effective precautions, recruitment for a program of this nature at the"proper" or "conventional" time may result merely in the re-allocation of generally scarce but qualified teacher personnel from one set of duties to another. Unless implementation of special educational programs results in real increases in the number of qualified participating individuals and the number of teacher-days, the allocation of special funds for such programs may merely produce new administrative burdens without materially changing the total educational enterprise.

Interviews with four of the seven teachers listed as participating in the Program yielded the following information about their qualifications and backgrounds.

a) There was one teacher who was specifically trained in the field of speech improvement (on the Bachelor's degree level). She was on mandatory maternity leave from the New York City schools at the beginning of the school year. When invited to join the Program, she could arrange to leave her infant for only a few hours a week. A major portion of the available time of this teacher was assigned to a different speech program (a speech therapy program for Non-Public Schools) at the same school where she taught speech improvement.

b) There were two teachers who had earlier in their careers taught speech, language arts, or conducted speech therapy in the New York City schools but who for personal or financial reasons preferred to remain in substitute or free-lance relations with the City's school system. One of these teachers, for example, earned her livelihood essentially from a private practice in speech therapy but was available for limited, informal association with the City's schools.

c) A fourth teacher who earned her livelihood as a dramatics coach proved to be totally unprepared for professional work as a teacher when observed in a classroom.

No more than one teacher was assigned to any school. The notion of assigning teams of speech improvement teachers to each school seems to have been abandoned entirely.

Numbers of Children Reached. In estimating that approximately 7,000 children would be reached by the Program, the formulators of the proposal apparently estimated reaching an average of 700 pupils in each school. No indications were given as to how many minutes of instruction per day or per week were anticipated for each child, the size of the groups for teaching the children in, nor whether all the pupils would be in direct contact with speech improvement teachers or whether some would be reached only through the mediation of their classroom teacher. No meaningful estimate may be offered here as to how many children were, in fact, reached by the Program. Patterns of instruction varied from school to school and even from day to day within schools. Estimates based on registers would be confounded by inconsistencies in a) the amounts of time of contact with the Program, b) whether the contacts were directly with speech improvement teachers or only with classroom teachers, c) the size of the groups in which the contact occurred, d) the quality of the contact, etc. With these confounding factors in mind, it may be roughly estimated, judging from classroom enrollments and numbers of periods taught by those speech improvement teachers who were observed that the speech improvement

teachers were seen by more than 1,750 children and less than 3,500, i.e. more than a quarter but less than a half of the projected number.

Strategy for Distributing Resources. In a preliminary program avowedly in need of evaluation, it would seem that the best estimate of the potential effectiveness, and thus the best strategy given the limited personnel, would have been obtained from concentrating whatever resources were available in an optimal and uniform fashion upon a limited sample of schools and number of children. The proportion of resources to schools and children originally deemed appropriate might have been maintained. It is to be noted that the application of the alternative strategy of spreading available resources thinly resulted partially from the fact that the available teachers often had very explicit and restricting preferences as to where they wished to teach and how far they were willing to travel and partially from the fact that the acuteness of the personnel shortage did not become apparent until after initial assignments, on a spotty basis, had been made. Since less than 25 per cent of the planned resources in personnel were distributed to 80 per cent of the projected number of schools, it is unlikely that the Program resulted in a noticeable or measurable impact upon the pupils it did reach.

Operation of Implementation

Conferences and Co-operative Planning. Conversations with special speech improvement teachers and classroom teachers indicated that conferences between the two had occurred. The evaluator is not in a position to judge whether these conferences occurred with all classroom teachers in the schools nor may any statements be made as to their possible effectiveness.

One speech improvement teacher seems to have met exclusively with the principal of the school and the conferences consisted of selecting a graduation play for the speech class which the speech improvement teacher proceeded to coach. In two of the schools visited, it seemed apparent that the Program resulted in no changes in the schedules of the classroom teachers and that the schedules of the speech improvement teachers (particularly the schedules of those working in two schools or in two programs) were rather tight. It is unlikely, therefore, that extensive conferences with all classroom teachers occurred.

Demonstration Lessons. The demonstration lessons seem to have been the heart of the Program. Since the speech improvement teachers were generally experienced as specialist teachers who conducted speech classes, it was to be expected that they would interpret their role in the present Program in a similar manner. Thus visits to the schools revealed that the speech improvement teachers functioned mainly as specialist teachers conducting speech classes that were labeled demonstration lessons and that only secondarily did some of them function as change agents attempting to introduce their specialty to the faculty and into the general curriculum of the schools at which they worked.

The schools seem also to have interpreted the demonstration lessons as special speech classes. In one instance it was observed that the classroom teacher was called from the room for a lengthy conference with the school principal during the demonstration lesson. In a second instance no classroom

teacher was present with the speech teacher during a session of dramatics coaching that extended for over an hour. In a third instance, where the administration of the school expressed interest in having classroom teachers learn from the speech improvement teachers, the classroom teacher stood silently with folded hands and bent head throughout the demonstration lesson. Subsequent discussion with this teacher revealed that she had but poorly followed the point of the lesson conducted by the speech improvement teacher.

The nature and quality of the demonstration lessons is discussed more fully in the sections on "Interpretation and Implementation of Educational Objectives" and "Characteristics of Teaching."

Additional Speech Lessons and Integration of Speech Instruction with the Curriculum. The evaluator did not attempt a systematic assessment of the degree to which classroom teachers "carried through" on the Speech Improvement Program with additional lessons and in integrating speech skills with other aspects of their curricula. The limited scope of the Program and the unavailability of baseline data made unfeasible extensive observations of classroom teachers to determine the extent of carryover. The observations of the response of the schools to demonstration lessons noted above, alone seem to provide an adequate indication that very little in the way of carry through and integration with the school curriculum could be accomplished by the preliminary Program.

A group of classroom teachers in one of the schools, where the greatest effort to benefit from the program was observed, concurred that speech improvement teachers accomplished more with their pupils in the speech area than the classroom teachers had been able to. Some attributed this success to the special skills and techniques of the speech improvement teachers. Others, perhaps begrudgingly, stressed the greater responsiveness of pupils to new and infrequently visiting teachers. One teacher observed that in the speech improvement class the rank-ordering of students in respect to other school subjects changed,

suggesting that speech involved a special set of skills independent from those involved in other academic subjects or that the special skills of the speech improvement teacher effectively mobilized pupils who were otherwise apathetic. The evaluator also noted that the speech of some of these very classroom teachers was sub-standard and this factor alone would obviate effective integration of the Program.

In general, the predominant attitude of the schools was one of acceptance and welcome for the Program coupled with a policy that was, perhaps inadvertently, laissez-faire and uninvolved.

Consultation and Provision of Resource Material by Speech Improvement Teachers. No consultation and provision of resource material was directly observed in the evaluation. Such consultation could occur only in the setting of the conferences discussed above. To the extent that indirect evidence of some conferences and cooperative planning was gathered, it may be assumed that such consultation occurred.

One teacher proved to be acutely interested in the educational philosophies, speech habits and personality characteristics of the classroom teachers in the school in which she worked. She seemed, therefore, ready to consult with these teachers in their frame of reference and seems to have acquired her perceptions of these teachers in consultative interactions. Other speech improvement teachers seemed considerably less cognizant of the teachers, programs and philosophies of the schools in which they operated and, hence, less prepared to consult with them. It may be assumed that they did, in fact, consult very little. The teacher who seemed to have provided the most consultative services had considerably more school experience in her background than the others.

Orientation for Speech Improvement Teachers. The Program Director reported that all speech improvement teachers were given the orientation and pre-

Program instruction specified in the proposal. Since not all speech improvement teachers were hired before the Program began, it is obvious that much orientation occurred on an individual and informal basis. Workshops of other programs conducted by the Bureau for Speech Improvement seem to have been used to contribute to the orientation of teachers for the present Program.

Implementation of Educational Objectives

Analysis of the Objectives. Given the context for which it was prepared, the project proposal quite properly described the educational objectives of the Program in very general terms, such as the "development of skills in speaking and listening" and relates these skills to the problems of disadvantaged children. The evaluation of an educational program, however, requires a very detailed statement of objectives. In preliminary (perhaps, superficial evaluations) such as the evaluation conducted here, the explicit formulation of the objectives provides an opportunity for the evaluator to make his best guess as to whether the educational processes observed are relevant to achieving their objectives and are likely to be effective. In the more desirable, formal and objective evaluations, the specification of objectives is crucial to the selection or development of appropriate tests and measures from which inferences may be made as to whether the objectives of a program were in fact achieved. An attempt to develop an explicit analysis of objectives is, therefore, properly a task for this evaluation.

The objectives of educational programs in linguistic communication skills may be classified or located on a conceptual continuum extending from "concern for skill in the function of language" at the opposite pole. The term "mechanics of language" may include areas such as phonetics, dialect variation, voice intonation, morphology, syntax, "correct usage," etc. "Function of language" may

subsume the issue of coding (that is the conversion of non-linguistic reality into appropriate linguistic form), decoding or comprehension, etc. Much current psycholinguistic thought is concerned with the interdependences and facilitative reciprocal relations between language and thought. Those aspects of the education of communication skills that are concerned with the expansion of the intellect, the development of conceptual schema through language and vice-versa, may be said to be concerned with the development of skills in the "function" of language. At the "mechanics" end of the continuum there is concern for how something is said; at the "function" end there is concern not only for how something is said but also for what is said.

It is difficult to ascertain from the proposal for the Program under consideration where this Program may be located on the "mechanics-function" continuum. The term "speech" frequently refers exclusively to "how" things are said, implying a basic concern for the mechanics of language. Since, however, the proposal describes the speech of disadvantaged children as "inarticulate" and seeks remedy this defect, the Program seems to have been directed, at least partially, toward the function end of the continuum. The expressions "social effectiveness" and "social mobility" occur in several places in the proposal, suggesting again concern for those mechanical aspects of language associated with social class.

In the case of disadvantaged Negro children, however, it would be fatuous to anticipate that the "verbal class distinctions," a la Shaw's Pygmalion are the relevant Shibboleths that mark them for denial of social mobility. (A black Liza Doolittle could not have been passed off as a European duchess.) Nor would it befit an American educational system, dedicated to democratic ideals, to pander to prejudices of narrow minds that see superficial aspects such as dialect markers as reasons for denying equal opportunity to those whose

speech is "non-standard." It is to be assumed, therefore, that the concern of the present Program is not merely with the eradication of the bases for making prejudiced discriminations (any more than it could be for painting red roses white), but is directed at the more profound issues of more effective coding and the widening of intellectual horizons of disadvantaged children through improving their command of their language.

At this point, however, it is extremely important to note that the notion of improving one's intellectual competence through improving one's command over his language involves a number of assumptions that are in want of verification. The designation of the speech of the disadvantaged as "inarticulate" may be merely an artifact of the fact that those who have labelled it as such do not understand it. It is conceivable (and some linguists subscribe to the notion) that this kind of speech is extremely well suited for communication within the community in which it is used. There is, indeed, considerable discussion of "bi-dialectism" among American sub-cultures, psychologically akin to bi-lingualism, implying that the speech of some sub-cultures is different, but not inferior, to the speech of other cultures.

It would seem that research appropriate to the testing of the implicit assumptions underlying the present Program should, and can, constitute an integral part of the Program. Such research would be addressed to the question: Does the training in language skills in fact expand the intellect of the pupils trained? One criterion of the evaluation would then become "intellectual expansion" which might be measured by tests of intelligence and the like rather than by tests of speech.

The entire issue of what constitutes effective communication is, furthermore, in want of definition. The question as to whether the dialects of sub-

cultures are inferior to other dialects or whether they are merely different but equal modes of communication needs the development of objective, clearly operationalized, valid, and widely accepted systems of measurement. The development of such measuring systems would rightfully occupy a position in a research program attached to an educational program such as the present one. Further, since the educational Program is concerned with the development of a number of related but slightly different matters of language and intellect, it provides a possible setting for the validation of such measures.

In the absence of any explicit data for confirming the underlying assumptions of the proposal and valid measures of articulateness, communicative effectiveness or efficiency, the present evaluation proceeded with an intuitive approximation for scaling what in the Program was intellectually broadening and what was merely mechanical. In this scheme, the question as to whether an individual used /a^{h}/ in the place of the diphthong /a^{i}/ in the word <u>time</u>, for example, would be a purely mechanical matter, but the dropping of a tense marker that might lead to a misunderstanding, the inability properly linguistically to code a condition contrary to fact, or the absence of adequate vocabulary to deal with some problems of affect would be regarded as functional matters of great intellectual importance.

<u>Interpretation of Objectives by Program Personnel</u>. Discussion of the objectives of the basic speech improvement program with the personnel involved in the Program revealed variations in interpreting the objectives stated in the proposal. The Program Coordinator interpreted the objectives as being essentially the development of language function skills. Speech improvement was seen as an integral component of language arts programs. Further, in line with current theoretization about the relation between mastery of one's language and the acquisition of reading skill, it was suggested that a major benefit of the Program

could be ascertained in a controlled experiment where measured gains in reading skills could be attributed only to the Program. Yet, social considerations and the mechanical aspects of speech improvement were not neglected, inasmuch as pains were taken to point out to Program personnel and even to participating pupils that speech skills were important in making the proper impression in important life situations such as applying for a job.

Administrators and classroom teachers were not very articulate in their interpretation of objectives. Pragmatic benefits from speech programs--such as preparation for job interviews--seem to have appealed to their imaginations. Though no specific evidence was gathered to substantiate the impression, the evaluator felt that the school personnel he communicated with were themselves attempting to discover the objectives of the Program by observing how its curriculum was implemented in the classroom. It seemed that their avowed pleasure with the Program and gratitude for it was based on the fact that this essentially unsolicited city-run, federally-aided program made it possible for them to keep their schools abreast with an educational development that might otherwise have by-passed them.

Most of the speech improvement teachers interviewed nominally interpreted the objectives of the Program in a manner very similar to that of the Program Coordinator. Since the interpretation of objectives by speech improvement teachers was crucial in determning the actual nature of the Program, the most acute probes, including observations of their activities in the classroom, were applied to these individuals.

When observed in operation, concern for mechanical matters such as pronunciation, intonation and appropriate level of loudness were revealed to be an important component of the Program. Teachers of Negro children were concerned with whether they said /ta^{h}m/ or /taim/ and a teacher in a Yeshivah was very much occupied with

Yiddish intonation and with whether the children said /duiz/ or /duink/. (The evaluator noted, incidentally, that Negro girls were more likely to say /ta ^{h}m/ while the boys tended to say /taim/ suggesting that these mechanical matters might be related to some profound and complicated factors of personality and culture that would be of considerable educational significance in terms of linguistic "functioning" if properly teased out.)

One teacher, who devoted much attention to the pronunciation of English vowels, did so in an exercize that seemed clearly to be directed toward developing auditory discrimination and motor control; skills that are of high transfer value since they are relevant to general sensitivity to language, to foreign language learning and reading. Interestingly the vowels selected for study were not specifically those that characterized the Negro speech of her pupils. Her lesson on appropriate voice level seemed to be about to introduce some elementary concepts of the nature of communication nets and interpersonal activity.

The term "listening skills," which was frequently quoted from the proposal, seemed to give teachers considerable trouble. When probed, definitions of the term were vague and it was difficult to extract from any of the speech improvement teachers specifications of behavioral correlates that might be observed in a pupil who had acquired listening skills. The term seems to have become confounded with other terms such as "hearing," "attention," "comprehension," "distraction," etc. It is to be noted that all these terms might be defined in education and a confusion of the two sets of analysis and definition is likely to occur. (In education "attention" may mean attention to the teacher; in psychology it may mean attention to anything relevant to the <u>organism</u>.) It is the evaluator's impression that the term "listening skills" has crept into the parlance of speech education without being subjected to the appropriate critical analysis (for which there is no room

in this report) that would yield a clear and meaningful definition. Yet in one class, where pupils acted out in pantomine a story that had been told to them, attempting to interpret in bodily movements the personality characteristics of the characters of the story, one valid and meaningful definition of the "development of listening skills" was clearly implied.

Characteristics of the Teaching

The observed teaching by the speech improvement teachers ranged from excellent to very poor. The chief difficulty for all teachers seemed to be in making instruction meaningful to each child when class registers ranged from 30 to 50 children. In a program directed at the development of skills, practice is obviously an important component. A forty minute period occurring once or twice a week cannot succeed in providing each child with more than a minute or two of individualized supervised practice. Further, if a totally individualized approach is followed, each child may waste some 90 to 95 per cent of his time waiting for his turn (although some children may be observed practicing while their classmates are supervised). Yet many instances of series of totally individualized teaching were observed.

An alternative approach to supervised individualized practice--given the large class registers--is the use of a class period to teach techniques for practice and to develop in the pupils mastery of the criteria characterizing acceptable performances. Given this approach, considerable time will be spent describing skills that ought to be practiced and teachers will have little feed-back as to whether pupils are learning and able to apply what is said to them. This type of teaching may be made somewhat more effective by involving some children with making sample performances and involving others with making critiques as to the

adequacy of each performance. The effectiveness of this approach would seem to depend on the degree to which pupils accept the criteria for good performances as applicable to their own behavior and on the amount of practice the pupil conducts out of school. The second type of teaching with emphasis of description and criteria was observed to occur with approximately the same frequency as supervised individual practice. No assignments or suggestions for outside practice, however, were noted in the classes observed.

An alternative to the two aforementioned approaches would consist of extensive sub-group teaching. The speech improvement teacher might work with a group of 10 pupils at a time for short periods while the classroom teacher would work with the remainder of the class on some other subject of their curriculum that lent itself to individualized or sub-group teaching. There is reason to believe that in an area such as speech improvement, where changes in attitude and the practice of skills make crucial close pupil-teacher interaction, 10 minutes of instruction in a group of 10 would be more beneficial for each pupil than 50 minutes of instruction in a group of 40 or 50. When the possibilities of this approach were explored with one of the speech improvement teachers, it was noted that this approach would a priori defeat the concept of demonstration lessons. Futher, the approach was considered unfeasible, because it was felt that a) time would be lost in shuffling pupils, b) neither the teachers nor the schools were prepared for the possible complexities in scheduling this approach might entail, and c) the schools could not provide adequate space or facilities for this procedure. An entire program of "demonstration lessons" extending over a school year would obviously degenerate, however, into a program of specialist teaching in which the classroom teacher would be afforded an unproductive free period in which she would be constrained to remain in her classroom. Thus, if the technical difficulties could be overcome, there is much to recommend the frequent use of a sub-group teaching plan on at least an experimental basis.

RELATION OF THE SPEECH IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

As noted previously, the concept of a speech improvement program does not seem to have originated at the non-public schools where it was observed. Thus, there is little reason to expect--especially only after a very short and desultory pilot program--that any real integration with the regular curriculum had occurred. It would be of considerable interest to observe whether in the coming academic year an attempt will be made by the non-public schools to integrate the speech improvement Program with the general curriculum and whether any attempt will be made to integrate with each other the various programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). For example, will an attempt be made to coordinate reading, language arts, and speech programs so that each facilitates the others and none encroaches on the proper purview of the others? The prognosis this evaluator would tentatively suggest is that the schools will seek as much help from these programs as possible, accepting this help with passive, uncritical gratitude until the large number of uncoordinated programs threatens to wreck the equilibrium and normal functioning of the schools. In one school, a harassed principal was caught in a dilemma of scheduling interviews with the evaluators of two different programs both of whom were present in the school at the same time. It was reported that problems of this nature in connection with Program Coordinators had begun to appear when each of the ESEA programs was initiated. (Since not all of the programs were able to begin simultaneously on schedule, this problem did not become as acute as it might have become had there been greater efficiency.)

Generally speaking, teachers were observed deporting themselves in a professional manner attempting to give the children they encountered the best of their services, despite certain clearly noticeable undercurrents of a sense of strangeness public school teachers experienced in parochial settings of the non-public schools.

However, one instance was noted that underscores a more general problem of content of material used for speech improvement. In this instance, in spite of clear instructions to the contrary from the program supervisor, one teacher used material with highly religious content for instructional purposes. Also, the regular classroom teacher was absent during this program, which was counter to instructions. Obviously, this aspect will require careful monitoring in future programs of this type. Because of some of the sensitive issues involved in these types of new programs, caution must be exerted to comply with legal and professional requirements.

Learning by Pupils

As noted, no effort was made to assess formally what pupils had learned from the Program. Classroom observations revealed that many pupils learned those facts that were taught and those skills that were drilled. But the possible effects of this learning on test scores remains unknown.

The suggestions in the proposal providing for the use of school records, recordings, assessments through observations by teachers and standardized test data were ignored for the reasons listed below.

(a) The program was in progress by the time the evaluation was initiated and no pre-post or control-versus experimental-group assessments were possible.

(b) No assessments through observations by teachers seemed available, possibly because of lack of specificity in the proposal as to how these were to be collected.

(c) The lack of specificity in the description of the objectives made it impossible to specify, select, or construct measures that would be applicable to the Program. (Participants in the Program reported that the field of speech improvement was generally in need of developing appropriate measures for assessing learning in speech improvement programs.)

The incomplete, spotty, and thin implementation of the Program as well as the observed diversity of procedures suggested to the evaluator that it was very unlikely that a formal evaluation, using tests and measures, would have revealed any tangible effects. Experience with educational programs indicates that intensive and extensive training of pupils are necessary if statistically significant differences on standardized instruments are to be found. Nevertheless, fairness to any educational plan demands that a

formal evaluation, using appropriate measures, should be conducted as soon as feasible, on a subsequent staging of the plan.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered on the basis of the findings of this evaluation.

(a) The Program should not be attempted unless the problem of personnel is satisfactorily solved. It is conceivable that approaches other than the employment of speech improvement teachers may be feasible. It is perhaps possible to train highly competent school aides for a special teaching role in institutes conducted by leading authorities in speech improvement. Or, curricula specific to the objectives of the program might be prepared by authorities in the field, working as consultants, and implemented as part of the language arts curriculum using available school personnel. (The second approach would merely involve a modification in curricula rather than the institution of a new program.)

(b) An assessment as to how many qualified participants can be recruited should be made before attempting to implement the Program. Implementation should occur in only as many schools as can be adequately served by available personnel. Only an intensive Program can be effective. An extensive but thinly implemented Program creates many problems, the solutions of which are not warranted by the limited possible benefits of such a Program.

(c) The Program Director and Speech Improvement Teachers should arrive at a clear, specific, and explicit formulation of objectives. Implicit assumptions should be identified. The objectives should be related to specific curricula.

(d) The development of objectives should be closely linked with evaluation. Indeed, if the Program is to be effectively evaluated, the

participation of the evaluator is necessary in every phase of the planning.

(e) If the plan for using speech improvement teachers hired by the New York City Board of Education is retained, the notion of a consultative role should be abandoned in the proposal since it will inevitably be abandoned in practice. The program should be regarded as a specialist's program -- such as music, art, shop, etc. -- and any influence speech improvement teachers may exert on classroom teachers may be considered completely as though it were a bonus.

(f) The use of language laboratories, tape recorders and other play-back equipment in the execution of the Program should be explored. The use of special equipment, with carefully prescribed procedures, coupled with flexibility in classroom organization, may improve the characteristics of the teaching in the highly crowded conditions in which it occurs.

(g) Consideration should be given to coordinating the Program with programs in allied areas -- reading, language arts, foreign language, etc. -- and with other ESEA programs. Coordination with allied areas is necessary for the sake of sound education, Coordination with other ESEA programs is an administrative necessity.

(h) Machinery for monitoring the professionalism of teachers in respect to undue assistance to parochial education should be instituted. The specific procedures can be developed by the Board of Education in consultation with legal authorities on civil liberties and constitutional law. Legal council may be supplied by the municipal and federal governments involved in ESEA programs.

Generally speaking, it is the opinion of this evaluator that if adequate planning is not completed in time for the implementation of the Program, it would be wiser to expend a limited portion of allocated funds to preparing the Program than to expending all the funds on a slipshod implementation. A short, small scale, well-formulated program is infinitely more likely to achieve at least a portion of the objectives for which the Program was conceived than any extensive, but ill-formulated Program.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street, NYC 10036

Division of Educational Practices
Title I Evaluations

July, 1966

SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR TEACHING OF THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD

PARTICIPANT'S EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions

The Center for Urban Education, an independent educational research organization, has been assigned the task of appraising the Summer Institute for Teachers of the Disadvantaged Child with a view to improving future programs. As part of this research we are asking the participants in the Institute to give us their reactions to it, favorable as well as unfavorable, Since at the time you complete this questionnaire you may have participated in more than one session of the Institute, we would like you to focus your replies around the session you are currently attending.

Please answer all questions as specifically as you can, and feel free to use the back of the page if not enough space is provided for your answers.

In order to obtain a full and open response, we are requesting that you do not sign your name to this questionnaire.

1. What were your purposes in attending the Institute?

10-

11-

2. What specific understandings and techniques did you gain from attending the Institute? (Please state fully.)

12-

13-

19p

3. Listed below are the various aspects of the Institute's program. Please rate each one in terms of how valuable you found it to be by circling one of the numbers from -3 to +3. If you feel it was of no value, circle -3; if you feel it was extremely valuable, circle +3. If you feel that it was somewhere in between circle one of the numbers from -2 to +2. Then kindly explain your reasons for this rating in the space provided below the rating scale.

Of no Value — a. Guest Speakers — Extremely valuable

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 14-

Reasons for rating:

_____ 15-

_____ 16-

b. Demonstrations of Special Equipment, such as Projectors, etc.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 17-

Reasons for rating:

_____ 18-

_____ 19-

c. Demonstration Lessons

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 20-

Reasons for rating:

_____ 21-

_____ 22-

d. Other Staff Presentations

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 23-

Reasons for rating:

_____ 24-

_____ 25-

e. Small Group Discussions

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 26-

Reasons for rating:

_____ 27-

_____ 28-

Of no value — Extremely valuable

f. Field Trips

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 29-

Reasons for rating: _____ 30-

_____ 31-

_____

g. Reading Assignments

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 32-

Reasons for rating: _____ 33-

_____ 34-

_____

h. Instructional Materials

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 35-

Reasons for rating: _____ 36-

_____ 37-

_____

i. Institute Library

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3 38

Reasons for rating: _____ 39-

_____ 40-

_____

4. What recommendations would you make for changes in the Institute's program, facilities, materials, schedule, organization or staffing?

_____ 41-

_____ 42-

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. a. How would you rate the level of communication between staff and participants at the Institute?

Very poor -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 Excellent +3 43-

Reasons for rating: _____

_____ 44-

_____

_____

b. How valuable was the opportunity you had to discuss problems and ideas with other participants at the Institute?

Of no value -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 Extremely Valuable +3 45-

Reasons for rating: _____ 46-

_____

_____

_____

6. Do you feel that as a result of your attendance at the Institute you are better prepared to teach a class of disadvantaged children? (If "yes," How? If "no." Why not?)

_____ 47-

_____ 48-

_____

_____ 49-

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. a. Would you be interested in attending a future Institute for teachers of the disadvantaged?

Yes ____ 50-1
No ____ -2
Not sure ____ -3

b. (For those responding with "Yes" or "Not sure" to Question 7a):

Would you be willing to attend: (check one)

Only with remuneration ____ 51-1
Even without remuneration ____ -2

CLASSIFICATION DATA

Center at which Institute is being held _____ 52-

Institute course being completed in current session:

English ____ 53-1
History & Social Studies ____ -2
Urban Studies ____ -3
Math & Science ____ -4

Number of sessions taken to date: ____ 54-

Total number of sessions you are registered for this summer.....: ____ 55-

Present school assignment:
(check one)

Public school ____ 56-1
Non-Public school ____ -2

Grade level taught ____ 57-

Total years of teaching experience ____ 58-

Total years of teaching disadvantaged children ____ 59-

Today's date _____ 60-

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

August 1966

Summer Institutes for Teachers of the Disadvantaged

STAFF EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Note: Please use reverse side of page if more space is needed for your answers.

1. Of the several objectives of the Institute, which did you personally feel was the most important? second most important? etc.

2. In your opinion, which aspects of the Institute program (i.e. speakers, demonstration lessons, small group meetings, trips, etc.) were of most value to participants? (Why?)

3. In your opinion, which aspects were of least value? (Why?)

4. If you were setting up the Institute again next year, what changes would you make concerning each of the following areas?

a. Selection of participants

b. Program content

c. Organization and time schedule

4. (continued)

d. Staff

e. Facilities and equipment

f. Guest speakers

5. What other suggestions for changes do you have?

6a. How would you rate the level of communication and cooperation among the members of the staff at your center? (Kindly explain and illustrate.)

6b. How would you rate the level of communication and cooperation between staff and participants at your center? (Kindly explain and illustrate)

7. What is your estimate of the impact of the program on the participants? (On what specific observations do you base this estimate?)

8. How has the Institute affected your <u>own</u> professional growth? (Please explain)

9. Institute center number _____.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

July, 1966

SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD

TAI INVENTORY

Each of the statements listed below expresses an attitude or concept concerning the disadvantaged child. Kindly indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement with each by circling one of the four numbers to the right of each statement, as follows:

If you agree strongly, circle +2
If you agree somewhat, circle +1
If you disagree somewhat, circle -1
If you disagree strongly, circle -2

Please work quickly, since first impressions are usually the best. In order to minimize "expected" replies we are requesting that you do not sign your name to this questionnaire.

			IBM Col. No.
1.	Even the most creative teacher of disadvantaged children can expect to attain only very limited gains with them.	-2 -1 +1 +2	11
2.	Since the disadvantaged child's verbal ability is so poor the teacher should take every opportunity to correct his speech errors.	-2 -1 +1 +2	12
3.	The disadvantaged child is not a good subject for "inductive" teaching.	-2 -1 +1 +2	13
4.	Few teachers prefer to work with disadvantaged children.	-2 -1 +1 +2	14
5.	The curriculum for disadvantaged children should consist of self-contained activities which are minimally related to what has gone before or what is to come.	-2 -1 +1 +2	15
6.	The teacher of the disadvantaged child should avoid references to the child's home and community in her lessons because these are likely to be painful and unpleasant subjects for the pupil.	-2 -1 +1 +2	16
7.	Most teachers are fearful about teaching in disadvantaged neighborhoods.	-2 -1 +1 +2	17
8.	Since the disadvantaged child learns best through constant repetition of the same material, the "spiral" approach is not applicable to him.	-2 -1 +1 +2	18
9.	Because of his overly-concrete mode of thinking, the disadvantaged child is rarely capable of handling abstract concepts.	-2 -1 +1 +2	19

			IBM Col. No.
10.	The disadvantaged child's frequent outbursts of hostility are really hard to take.	-2 -1 +1 +2	20
11.	In reaching the disadvantaged child, the teacher's personal contribution is more important than having the proper curricula materials.	-2 -1 +1 +2	21
12.	One of the hardest things to get used to about teaching disadvantaged children is that most of them come to school quite unclean.	-2 -1 +1 +2	22
13.	The disadvantaged child's capacity for learning is pretty well set by the time he reaches school age.	-2 -1 +1 +2	23
14.	Most school administrators would probably not be very enthusiastic about a teacher's attempts to use new methods with disadvantaged children.	-2 -1 +1 +2	24
15.	The new curriculum approaches developed for gifted children have little relevance for teaching the disadvantaged child.	-2 -1 +1 +2	25
16.	The disadvantaged child has a greater need than others for a structured classroom routine.	-2 -1 +1 +2	26
17.	The search for new curricula for the disadvantaged child is too recent to have provided approaches of concrete value to the teacher.	-2 -1 +1 +2	27
18.	A teacher of disadvantaged children should focus on reading and give only residual attention to other curriculum areas.	-2 -1 +1 +2	28
19.	The disadvantaged child's ability to observe is not as impaired as his verbal ability.	-2 -1 +1 +2	29
20.	Because the disadvantaged child is unused to intellectual stimulation, he should be exposed to it in very small doses.	-2 -1 +1 +2	30
21.	One of the frustrations in working with disadvantaged children is that they do not really appreciate your efforts.	-2 -1 +1 +2	31
22.	The disadvantaged child has a greater need to experience success in school than the middle class child.	-2 -1 +1 +2	32
23.	Most disadvantaged children do not have the "stick-to-it-tiveness" to use programmed self-instructional devices.	-2 -1 +1 +2	33
24.	It is unrealistic for the teacher of the disadvantaged child to set her sights high.	-2 -1 +1 +2	34
25.	Teaching disadvantaged children can be as satisfying an experience as teaching advantaged children.	-2 -1 +1 +2	35
26.	The disadvantaged child should not be made to feel that middle class values are more acceptable to the teacher than lower class values.	-2 -1 +1 +2	36

			IBM Col. No.
27.	It's discouraging to try new teaching approaches with the disadvantaged when the children do not even pay attention to what the teacher is saying.	-2 -1 +1 +2	37
28.	Having been raised in a ghetto the disadvantaged child is not aware that his culture is different from that of society-at-large.	-2 -1 +1 +2	38
29.	The disadvantaged child requires a consistent environment; therefore team teaching is not a suitable approach for him.	-2 -1 +1 +2	39
30.	Teaching the disadvantaged child is truly a matter of all work and no play.	-2 -1 +1 +2	40
31.	The teacher of disadvantaged children should stick to recommended techniques and avoid experimentation.	-2 -1 +1 +2	41
32.	The disadvantaged child is usually aware of everything being said by the teacher even though he may not appear to be actively listening.	-2 -1 +1 +2	42
33.	Because the disadvantaged child displays a delayed learning "readiness" more complex concepts should not be introduced until the later grades.	-2 -1 +1 +2	43
34.	A teacher at a disadvantaged school runs substantial risk of being physically harmed.	-2 -1 +1 +2	44
35.	A disadvantaged child's use of "hip" expressions should be corrected immediately.	-2 -1 +1 +2	45
36.	Role-playing is not suitable for the disadvantaged child because of his difficulty in expressing himself.	-2 -1 +1 +2	46
37.	As long as the parents of disadvantaged children remain apathetic and irresponsible, the teachers can expect to accomplish very little with these children.	-2 -1 +1 +2	47
38.	Audio-visual aids, if improperly used, might reinforce the passivity of the disadvantaged child.	-2 -1 +1 +2	48
39.	A teacher cannot be expected to mitigate intellectual damage suffered by a disadvantaged child by the time he reaches school age.	-2 -1 +1 +2	49
40.	A disadvantaged child should be helped from the beginning to understand that his language is not the language he is expected to use in school.	-2 -1 +1 +2	50
41.	Especially with disadvantaged children, the teacher should check to see if every homework and classroom assignment has been completed.	-2 -1 +1 +2	51
42.	In the battle to overcome his difficult environment, the disadvantaged child has not developed a sense of fair play.	-2 -1 +1+2	52
43.	Teachers in disadvantaged areas should be given a substantial salary increment in recognition of the difficult job they have.	-2 -1 +1 +2	53
44.	The disadvantaged child's curriculum should emphasize only the most essential skills and knowledge he will need to get along.	-2 -1 +1 +2	54
45.	If a teacher succeeds in motivating only one out of five in a class of disadvantaged children, she is doing well.	-2 -1 +1 +2	55

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd St.N.Y.C.

Educational Practices Division
Title I Evaluations

Project: SUMMER INSTITUTES FOR TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD

(Dr. M. Gewirtz)

FACTOR I

Item #	Loading	Content
20	.54	Because the disadvantaged child is unused to intellectual stimulation, he should be exposed to it in very small doses.
24	.52	It is unrealistic for the teacher of the disadvantaged child to set her sights high.
1	.50	Even the most creative teacher of disadvantaged children can expect to attain only very limited gains with them.
15	.45	The new curriculum approaches developed for gifted children have little relevance for teaching the disadvantaged child.
9	.44	Because of his overly-concrete mode of thinking, the disadvantaged child is rarely capable of handling abstract concepts.
3	.42	The disadvantaged child is not a good subject for "inductive" teaching.
8	.41	Since the disadvantaged child learns best through constant repetition of the same material, the "spiral" approach is not applicable to him.
45	.41	If a teacher succeeds in motivating only one out of five in a class of disadvantaged children, she is doing well.
44	.41	The disadvantaged child's curriculum should emphasize only the most essential skills and knowledge he will need to get along.
5	.40	The curriculum for disadvantaged children should consist of self-contained activities which are minimally related to what has gone before or what is to come.
33	.36	Because the disadvantaged child displays a delayed learning "readiness" more complex concepts should not be introduced until the later grades.
23	.36	Most disadvantaged children do not have the "stick-to-it-tiveness" to use programmed self-instructional devices.

- continued -

FACTOR I (continued)

Item #	Loading	Content
17	.34	The search for new curricula for the disadvantaged child is too recent to have provided approaches of concrete value to the teacher.
12	.33	One of the hardest things to get used to about teaching disadvantaged children is that most of them come to school quite unclean.
18	.33	A teacher of disadvantaged children should focus on reading and give only residual attention to other curriculum areas.
21	.32	One of the frustrations in working with disadvantaged children is that they do not really appreciate your efforts.
13	.27	The disadvantaged child's capacity for learning is pretty well set by the time he reaches school age.

FACTOR II

Item #	Loading	Content
31	.50	The teacher of disadvantaged children should stick to recommended techniques and avoid experimentation.
35	.50	A disadvantaged child's use of "hip" expressions should be corrected immediately.
6	.42	The teacher of the disadvantaged child should avoid references to the child's home and community in her lessons because these are likely to be painful and unpleasant subjects for the pupil.
30	.39	Teaching the disadvantaged child is truly a matter of all work and no play.
36	.39	Role-playing is not suitable for the disadvantaged child because of his difficulty in expressing himself.
40	.39	A disadvantaged child should be helped from the beginning to understand that his language is not the language he is expected to use in school.
29	.37	The disadvantaged child requires a consistent environment; therefore team teaching is not suitable approach for him.
2	.37	Since the disadvantaged child's verbal ability is so poor the teacher should take every opportunity to correct his speech errors.
39	.37	A teacher cannot be expected to mitigate intellectual damage suffered by a disadvantaged child by the time he reaches school age.
42	.36	In the battle to overcome his difficult environment, the disadvantaged child has not developed a sense of fair play.
28	.31	Having been raised in a ghetto the disadvantaged child is not aware that his culture is different from that of society-at-large.

FACTOR III

Item #	Loading	Content
22	.41	The disadvantaged child has a greater need to experience success in school than the middle class child.
25	.33	Teaching disadvantaged children can be as satisfying an experience as teaching advantaged children.
19	.32	The disadvantaged child's ability to observe is not as impaired as his verbal ability.
26	.28	The disadvantaged child should not be made to feel that middle class values are more acceptable to the teacher than lower class values.
41	.28	Especially with disadvantaged children, the teacher should check to see if every homework and classroom assignment has been completed.
11	.28	In reaching the disadvantaged child, the teacher's personal contribution is more important than having the proper curricula materials.

FACTOR IV

Item #	Loading	Content
10	.48	The disadvantaged child's frequent outbursts of hostility are really hard to take.
4	42	Few teachers prefer to work with disadvantaged children.
7	.41	Most teachers are fearful about teaching in disadvantaged neighborhoods.
34	.39	A teacher at a disadvantaged school runs substantial risk of being physically harmful.
37	.35	As long as the parents of disadvantaged children remain apathetic and irresponsible, the teachers can expect to accomplish very little with these children.
27	.32	It's discouraging to try new teaching approaches with the disadvantaged when the children do not even pay attention to what the teacher is saying.

Plan for Follow-up Study on

1966 Summer Institutes for Teachers of Disadvantaged

A. Objective

To obtain a measure of the impact of the 1966 Summer Institutes experience on the classroom activities of the participants at the Institutes.

B. Study Design

Experimental group: 60 teachers who participated in Institutes divided equally among four courses and by public school and non-public school.

Control group: 60 teachers who applied for but did not attend Institutes and who are matched with the experimental group by type of school, courses taught, grade level, years of experience, and sex.

C. Instruments and Procedure

1. Observation of classroom activities: by experienced observers employing modified form of Anderson's "Classroom Observation Guide". (They should have no previous knowledge of whether teacher is in experimental or control group.)

2. A copy of above guide to be filled out by teacher's regular supervisor.

3. An open-ended questionnaire to be filled out by teacher herself on her classroom activities. Among former participants, this would include questions on specific uses of Institute experience. (This should be mailed to teacher after observations are made.)

D. Analysis

1. "t" tests would be conducted for differences between experimental and control groups on means of ratings of observation guide.

2. Qualitative analysis would be made at replies to open-end questionnaire.